

## THE BEGINNINGS OF VAIŚNAVISM

The subject of my talk<sup>1</sup> has been announced as « The Beginnings of Vaiśnavism ». What, however, I propose to do this evening is to make a few general observations on the early phases of Vaiśnavism as reflected in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and Patañjali's great commentary on it. Without discussing at any length the question of the dates of Pāṇini and Patañjali, for my present purpose, I take Pāṇini to have lived in the fifth century B.C. and Patañjali about 150 B.C. I am aware of the view of some scholars that the *Mahābhāṣya* (MB) contains certain interpolations made at a much later date<sup>2</sup>, but I do not find that view quite convincing.

I shall begin with the assumption, which, I believe, will be readily acceptable to all, namely, that, when the Vedic Aryans arrived in India, there was by no means any kind of religious vacuum in this country. Different religious cults prevailed in different regions of the pre-Vedic non-Aryan India. It is possible to identify at least two main such cults, which I would designate as the Muni-Yati-cult and the Bhakta-cult in contradistinction from the Vedic Aryan religious cult which I would characterise as the Ṛṣi-cult. Broadly speaking, the Muni-Yati-cult subsisted as a dominant feature of the Paśupati-Śiva religion of the Indus valley as also of the ancient Magadhan religious complex which latter eventually proved to be the fountain-head of Jainism and Buddhism among others<sup>3</sup>. It may be presumed that the indigenous Muni-Yati- and Bhakta-cults and the exotic Ṛṣi-cult exercised significant influence upon one another, both in a positive and a negative sense. For instance, the Vedic god Rudra is but a Vedic Aryan version of the pre-Vedic non-Aryan Śiva, both in name and character. On the other hand, there

1. Open lecture delivered on June 12, 1975, at the Second World Sanskrit Conference held at Torino (Italy) from the 9th to the 15th of June 1975.

2. Cf. D. C. SIRCAR, *IHQ* 15, 633-38.

3. DANDEKAR, *Some Aspects of the History of Hinduism*, Ch. I and p. 87.

are clear indications in the *R̄gveda* of the Vedic Aryan antagonism towards the Yatis, the Śiśnadevas, and the Mūradevas<sup>4</sup>. It is again not improbable that Vasiṣṭha's attitude towards Varuṇa was influenced by the indigenous Bhakta-cult. It would seem that, on account of its freshness, vigour, and flush of victory, the Vedic Aryan religion overwhelmed the various indigenous religious cults and kept them under suppression for a fairly long time. When, however, the hold of that religion upon the people at large began to dwindle owing to various obvious reasons in the last days of the major *Upaniṣads*<sup>5</sup>, that is, in the seventh-sixth centuries B.C., the indigenous religious cults again came into their own and soon developed into potent religious forces to such an extent that they eventually came to pose a serious challenge to the Vedic religion itself.

The doctrine of Bhakti may be said to constitute perhaps the most significant feature of what we today understand by Vaiṣṇavism. And one of the correlates of Bhakti is the concept of *āśis*, that is, special benediction or grace of god. In P. (Pāṇini-Sūtra) VI.2.148, *kārakād dat-aśrutayor evā 'śiṣi*, there occurs an indication of such benediction or grace. Speaking about the accent, this Sūtra tells us that, in respect of a name, which implies benediction, such as Devadatta (which is explained as *devā enāṁ deyāsuh*), the posterior member of the compound, being a past passive participle, gets the Udātta accent on its last syllable, only if that past passive participle is either *datta* or *śruta*<sup>6</sup>. It is suggested that a similar kind of benediction or grace is intended also in P.V.3.84<sup>7</sup>.

More pertinent to our present purpose, however, is the group of Sūtras, P. IV.3.95-99. P. IV.3.95 is made up of one single word, namely, *bhaktiḥ*. But, in this context, the word *bhakti* is used in a variety of senses, such as, 'attachment', 'liking', 'loyalty', and 'religious devotion'. It may also be noted that, here, commentators understand the word *bhakti* in the sense of 'object of *bhakti*' (*bhaktivīṣaya*). The Sūtras mention different terminations to be affixed to different words while forming from those words derivatives meaning persons who entertain *bhakti* for the entities (things, persons, etc.) denoted by those words. For instance, according to P. IV.3.95, as explained by commentators, the termination *an* is used in the case of persons entertaining *bhakti* or attachment for a certain locality. Thus a person, the object of whose *bhakti* or attachment is Srughna, is called Sraughna<sup>8</sup>. In the case of a

4. DANDEKAR, « Rudra in the Veda », *JUPHS* 1, pp. 94-148.

5. DANDEKAR, « Cultural Background of the Veda », *UCR* 11, 135-151.

6. The first Vārttika of this Sūtra points out that, if in such a name no benediction is implied, there is no *antodāttatva* of the posterior member. For instance, in the case of Devadatta, which is the name of a conch but which does not imply benediction, the Sūtra VI.2.148 does not apply.

7. The Sūtra reads: *śevalasuparivīśālavaruṇāryamādināṁ tṛtīyāt*.

8. *srughnaḥ bhaktiḥ asya sraughnaḥ*.

person who entertains *bhakti* or liking for a thing, which is insentient and which denotes something other than space or time, the termination is *thañ*<sup>9</sup>. Accordingly, one, the object of whose liking is *apūpa*, is called *āpūpika*<sup>10</sup>. The termination *thañ* is used to derive a word meaning one who entertains *bhakti* for *Mahārāja* — P. IV.3.97: *mahārājāt̄ thañ*<sup>11</sup>. The exact sense of the word *mahārāja* in this Sūtra is not clear. It is suggested that *mahārāja* may here denote Kubera<sup>12</sup> or a Lokapāla in general<sup>13</sup>. Or, otherwise, on the strength of P. IV.2.35 — *mahārājaproṣṭhapadāt̄ thañ* — *mahārāja* is understood as some kind of divinity<sup>14</sup>. It is, however, not improbable that, in P. IV.3.97, the word, *mahārāja*, is used in a political sense and that *bhakti*, in that case, denotes 'loyalty'.

It may be noted that the meanings of the word *bhakti* in connection with the three Sūtras — P. IV.3.95-97 — discussed above (namely 'attachment', 'liking', 'loyalty') are more or less secular in character. The Sūtra in this group, which is most crucial for our present purpose, is P. IV.3.98: *vāsudevārjunābhyām vun*. It purports to say that the derivatives from the words, *vāsudeva* and *arjuna*, meaning Vāsudeva-bhakta and Arjuna-bhakta, are formed by affixing the termination *vun* to those words. Accordingly, those derivatives are *vāsudevaka* and *arjunaka*. Now the question is asked: What is the specific reason for mentioning *vāsudeva* in this Sūtra? The next Sūtra, P. IV.3.99: *gotrakṣatriyākhyebhyo bahulāni vuñ*, tells us that the derivatives from the names of Gotras and Kṣatriyas, in the sense of persons entertaining *bhakti* for those Gotras and Kṣatriyas, are mostly formed with the termination *vuñ*. The word *vāsudeva*, which is the name of a Kṣatriya and which is therefore covered by this Sūtra, would thus give the derivative, *vāsudevaka*, in the sense of Vāsudeva-bhakta. There is no difference between the word *vāsudevaka* formed with *vun* and the word *vāsudevaka* formed with *vuñ* so far as the form and the accent (and also the meaning) of those words are concerned<sup>15</sup>. Why, then, is *vāsudeva* separately mentioned in P. IV.3.98?

Patañjali, in his *MB*, seeks to justify the mention of *vāsudeva* in P. IV.3.98 in two ways: Normally, according to P. II.2.34<sup>16</sup>, the first member of a Dvandva compound should have a smaller number of syllables. But Vārttika 4 of that Sūtra — *abhyarhitam* — sets forth an exception to this general rule, namely, that, irrespective of the number of syllables in it, the word denoting a superior entity should be made

9. P. IV.3.96: *acittād adeśakālāt̄ thañ*.

10. *apūpāḥ bhaktiḥ asya āpūpikāḥ*.

11. *mahārājāḥ bhaktiḥ asya māhārājikāḥ*.

12. Cf. V. S. AGRAWALA, *India as known to Pāṇini*, p. 359.

13. This is, however, a later Buddhist sense.

14. Commentators explain: *mahārājāḥ devatāḥ asya māhārājikam*.

15. In the case of the word *arjuna*, on the other hand, the termination *vun* will give the derivative *arjunaka* while the termination *vuñ* will give *ārjunaka*.

16. *alpāctaram*.

the first member of a Dvandva compound. The word *vāsudevā* is included in P. IV.3.98 as the first member of the compound *vāsudevārjunābhyām* to indicate the superiority of Vāsudeva to Arjuna. This explanation is quite irrelevant and unconvincing. The rules and exceptions relating to the Dvandva compound have already been laid down and discussed in an earlier chapter. There was no need to confirm any of them in the present context, as Patañjali does by saying: *vāsudevaśabdasya pūrvanipātam vaksyāmi*. The second explanation, as is generally the case with Patañjali, is more pertinent. Patañjali points out — and here we can do no better than depend on Patañjali — that Vāsudeva mentioned by Pāṇini in IV.3.98 cannot be said to have been covered by IV.3.99. For, Vāsudeva of P. IV.3.98 is not the name of any ordinary Kṣatriya, but it is the name of the 'worshipful one'<sup>17</sup>. In other words, *vāsudeva* of P. IV.3.98 signifies the god Vāsudeva as against any ordinary Kṣatriya, named Vāsudeva, who may be covered by the word *kṣatriya* in P. IV.3.99. Thus, according to Pāṇini, the word for the Bhakta of Vāsudeva, the god, is to be derived by affixing the termination *vun*, while that for the Bhakta of Vāsudeva, any ordinary Kṣatriya, is to be derived by affixing the termination *vuñ* — though, eventually, the form and the accent of the so derived words may be the same<sup>18</sup>.

It may be pointed out that some editions of the *MB* read *samjnai* 'śā *tatrabhagavataḥ* for *samjnai* 'śā *tatrabhavataḥ*. The intention of P. IV.3.98, namely, that *vāsudeva* mentioned in the Sūtra is the name of a god is thereby made quite explicit. Kaiyatā also seems to accept that reading, for, his gloss reads: *nityaḥ paramātmavasiṣṭa iha vāsudevo grhyate*. It would, however, seem that *tatrabhagavataḥ* was a deliberate emendation of *tatrabhavataḥ*. The critical edition of the *MB* by Kielhorn<sup>19</sup> leaves no doubt about this. Moreover, the occurrence of *tatra* in *tatrabhagavataḥ* is rather strange. It is also to be remembered that in most cases where the word *bhagavat* occurs in the *MB*, it refers to Pāṇini<sup>20</sup>.

That the word *tatrabhavat*, in this context, implies divinity can be safely presumed<sup>21</sup>. It is used in opposition to the word *kṣatriya*; *tatrabhavān* here denotes one who is different from a Kṣatriya. He (that is, *tatrabhavān*) may be a 'worshipful' Kṣatriya (as against an 'ordinary' Kṣatriya); or he may be a non-Kṣatriya worshipful one, that is, a Brāhmaṇa, etc.; or, finally, he may be a 'non-human' worshipful one as against a Kṣatriya human. In the first alternative, the suggested dichotomy would be between 'worshipful' and 'ordinary' or 'normal'; in the second, between 'non-Kṣatriya' and 'Kṣatriya'; and, in the third, between 'non-

17. *athavā nai 'śā kṣatriyākhyā | samjnai 'śā tatrabhavataḥ*.

18. Logically, Sūtra 98 should have come after Sūtra 99. Or, better still, it should have been given as a Vārttika of Sūtra 99.

19. Third Ed. pub. by BORI, Poona, 1962-1972.

20. In one place, it seems to refer to Kātyāyana.

21. GONDA, *Aspects of Early Viṣṇuism*, 160 ff., is doubtful about this.

human' or 'divine' and 'human'. P. IV.3.99, which mentions *kṣatriya* without suggesting any distinction between 'ordinary' and 'worshipful', rules out the first alternative. It may also be noted, in this connection, that Patañjali uses the word *tatrabhavān* without any substantive. The second alternative also is rendered nugatory in view of the fact that Patañjali hardly ever employs the word *vāsudeva* as the name of a person belonging to a social order other than Kṣatriya<sup>22</sup>. We have, therefore, to assume that *tatrabhavān* Vāsudeva (mentioned in P. IV.3.98) is a god and is to be distinguished from a Kṣatriya whose name might be Vāsudeva and who could then be covered by P. IV.3.99. It may be, incidentally, added that Vāsudeva, when coupled with Arjuna, usually denotes a god.

It is, however, not intended to be suggested that wherever the word *tatrabhavān* occurs in the *MB* it refers to a god. The word occurs fourteen times in the *MB*. In all these contexts, except three, the substantives qualified by *tatrabhavat* are specifically mentioned. In the three passages, which represent the exception, *tatrabhavān* is not followed by any substantive; that is to say, it is itself used in the sense of a substantive. Two of these three passages, namely, commentaries on P. IV.2.25 and P. IV.3.98, read *samjñai 'śā tatrabhavataḥ*. P. IV.2.25 — *kasyet* — explains, among other things, the form *kāya* in the sense of 'something whose divinity is Ka or Prajāpati'<sup>23</sup>. The question is there posed regarding the call which the Adhvaryu is required to give out to the Hotṛ in connection with the Puronuvākyā relating to the offering to Ka (*kāyam haviḥ*). Should it be *kasmai anubrūhi* (on the assumption that *kāyam* presupposes the ādeśa to *kim*) or *kāya anubrūhi* (on the assumption that *ka* is an independent word)? Patañjali concludes that, in either case, the call should be *kasmai anubrūhi* (with the pronominal dative *kasmai*), for, he argues with rather queer logic, both *kim* and *ka* are *sarvanāmas* — *kim* because it is a pronoun, and *ka* because it is the *nāma* (name) of *svarva* (that is, Prajāpati). Continuing, Patañjali alludes to another view on the subject and ends with the statement, *samjñā cai 'śā tatrabhavataḥ*. What is relevant to our present purpose is that the word *tatrabhavat* (used by itself) in this statement clearly denotes a god, that is, Prajāpati. The context permits no doubt about this whatsoever. One would, therefore, be fully justified in inferring that, in an exactly similar statement in the commentary on P. IV.3.98 also<sup>24</sup>, the word *tatrabhavat* denotes a god. This would then support our earlier contention that *vāsudeva* in P. IV.3.98 is the name of a god. The godhead of Vāsudeva and Vāsudevism or the religion centering round Vāsudeva

22. Besides, the word *gotra* in P. IV.3.99 may be understood to cover Brāhmaṇas, to some extent.

23. *kaḥ devatā asya kāyam: kāyam haviḥ*.

24. The word *ca* is omitted in the latter statement.

(which has to be regarded as the primary form of the classical Vaisnavism) must have become fairly well established in Pāṇini's time (5th century B.C.) — indeed, so much so that Pāṇini thought it necessary to compose a special Sūtra in respect of them.

It may be presumed that the popular religion with its cult of Bhakti, which had been reduced to a kind of torpidity on account of the increasingly pervasive influence of the Vedic Aryan religion, became re-animated, as it were, as the vitality of the Vedic religion began to diminish, and an aspect of it emerged in the form of Vāsudevism and, as we have seen, became a dominant force already in Pāṇini's time. The tradition of the supreme godhead of Vāsudeva and of Vāsudevism has been continuous ever since that time. Megasthenes (4th century B.C.) speaks of the people of Śurasena who held Heracles (by whom Megasthenes obviously meant Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa) in special veneration<sup>25</sup>. The *Bhagavadgītā* (3rd century B.C.) eulogises the man of knowledge, who, at the end of several births, betakes himself unto the Lord in the conviction « Vāsudeva is All » (VII.19). We then have the Besnagar inscription, belonging to the last quarter of the second century B.C., on the Garudadhvaja of Vāsudeva, the god of gods, erected by Heliodorus, the Bhāgavata, the son of Dion and an inhabitant of Takṣaśilā.

We have seen that Patañjali has characterised Vāsudeva of P. IV.3.98 as *tatrabhavat* and has thereby isolated him from any Kṣatriya whose name may be Vāsudeva. But there is a well-attested tradition that the god Vāsudeva himself originally belonged to the Kṣatriya family of the Vṛṣnis. In this context, one may just remind oneself of the Lord's statement in the *Bhagavadgītā*, namely: « Of the Vṛṣnis, I am Vāsudeva » (X.37). This tradition is confirmed also by the *MB*. Commenting on the seventh Vārttika<sup>26</sup> of P. IV.1.114<sup>27</sup>, Patañjali relates Vāsudeva to the Vṛṣṇi family: *vṛṣṇyano 'vakāśah / vāsudevah bāladevah*. That, here, the divine Vāsudeva is intended becomes clear from his association with Baladeva<sup>28</sup>. Saṅkarṣaṇa was a well-known Vṛṣṇi prince (who too was deified), and inscriptions closely ally Vāsudeva with him thereby implying that Vāsudeva also was a Vṛṣṇi prince who was later deified<sup>29</sup>. Thus the Ghosundi stone inscription of king Sarvatāta, belonging to the second half of the first century B.C., mentions the construction of a stone enclosure, called Nārāyaṇa-vāṭaka, for the place of worship of the gods Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva. Similarly, homage is paid to Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva in the Nanaghat cave inscription of the Sātavāhana queen Nāganikā of the first century B.C. The *Kāśikā* emphasises this

25. It is suggested that Megasthenes must have rendered Hari-Kṛṣṇa as Heracles.

26. *senāntāṇyaḥ*.

27. *rṣyandhakavṛṣṇikurubhyas ca*.

28. It is significant that the *Kāśikā* mentions Aniruddha also in this context.

29. It is by no means unusual that a historical personage, particularly a religious leader, is deified in course of time.

close relationship between Saṁkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva by giving the example, *dvandvāṁ saṁkarṣaṇavāsudevau*, to illustrate P. VIII.1.15, *atyantasahacarite lokavijñāte dvandvam ity upasamkhyanam*. From all this, coupled with P. IV.3.98 as explained above, one may, indeed, presume that Vāsudeva of the Vṛṣnis had been deified and made into the supreme god of Vāsudevism already before Pāṇini's time.

Incidentally, a reference may be made in this context to the facts that there had been several Kṣatriya princes who bore the name Vāsudeva, but that it was only the Vṛṣni prince Vāsudeva who was deified and became the supreme god of Vāsudevism. Traditional legends are narrated of Vāsudeva, king of Pūṇḍrakas, and Vāsudeva, king of Karavīrapura, each of whom claimed to be the true divine Vāsudeva but whose claim was entirely nullified by the prowess of Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa of the Vṛṣnis<sup>30</sup>.

Though the religion centering round the popular god Vāsudeva had become well established since before Pāṇini's time, it is strange that the Buddhist canonical text *Ārāguttaranikāya*, which mentions<sup>31</sup> such religious sects as the Ājīvikas, the Nirgranthas, the Mundaśrāvakas, etc., does not refer to the Vāsudevakas. Similarly, Aśoka's inscriptions, which mention the Śramaṇas, the Brāhmaṇas, the Ājīvikas, and the Nirgranthas, do not speak of the Vāsudevakas. The only possible explanation of this would be that Vāsudevism, which was naturally restricted to the regions dominated by its chief promoters, namely, the Vṛṣnis, the Sātvatas, and the Yādavas-Ābhīras, had not till then spread far towards Eastern India which was the provenance of Buddhism. On the other hand, it was well known to Pāṇini of Takṣaśilā as also to Megasthenes, and it is also seen to have attracted, in course of time, even foreigners like Heliodorus. It may be further noted that the *Niddesa* works (1st century B.C.), which, though of the nature of commentaries, share the authority of the Pali canon, allude to various religious sects among which are included the worshippers of Vāsudeva and Baladeva. So far as Jainism is concerned, it seems to have been more positively responsive to Vāsudevism. The Vāsudeva-legends have markedly influenced the Jaina hagiology, particularly its concept of *trisaṁśiśalākāpuruṣas* who comprise, among others, nine Vāsudevas, nine Baladevas, and nine Prativāsudevas.

Another striking fact regarding the Vāsudeva-religion is that the word *vāsudevaka*, in the sense of a Bhakta of Vāsudeva, is not attested

30. About Pūṇḍraka Vāsudeva, see *MBh*. II.13.17-19; *Viṣṇu-P.* V.34; *Bhāgavata-P.* X.66.13-14. The name Pūṇḍraka is sometimes connected with *pundra* (head-mark of the Śaivas), and it is suggested that Pūṇḍraka Vāsudeva was the leader of the Śaivas who posed as Bhāgavatas. Pūṇḍraka Vāsudeva is also identified with the Vāsudeva of the Jainas. For Vāsudeva of Karavīrapura (Śṛgāla), see: *Harivamśa*, Appendix 18.

31. PTS ed., Vol. III, pp. 276 ff.

in any available literary work<sup>32</sup>. On the other hand, since a descriptive grammarian like Pāṇini has devoted a separate Sūtra to the morphological explanation of that word, it must have been very much in vogue in his time. We are, therefore, constrained to assume that considerable literature of non-Vedic character<sup>33</sup> existed in Pāṇini's time but that it is now lost to us<sup>34</sup>. Attention may be drawn to still another point which is important for the history of Vaiṣṇavism. Pāṇini impliedly speaks of a religious sect the main feature of which was *bhakti* of Vāsudeva. On the other hand, he does not allude to Vaiṣṇavism either directly or indirectly. It would, therefore, seem that the basic element of what has now come to be known as Vaiṣṇavism was the Vāsudeva-religion. In other words, the starting point of what we today understand by Vaiṣṇavism was not Viṣṇu but Vāsudeva. The term *vāsudevaka* must, accordingly, be regarded as having been much older than the term *vaiṣṇava*.

P. IV.3.98 implies that, besides the Vāsudeva-religion, there also existed, in Pāṇini's time, a religious sect centering round Arjuna. The word for the Bhakta of Arjuna the god was, according to P. IV.3.98, to be derived by affixing the termination *vun* to the word *arjuna* — it was *arjunaka*; the word for the Bhakta of a Kṣatriya called Arjuna was, on the other hand, to be derived by affixing the termination *vuñ* (P. IV.3.99) — it was *ārjunaka*. However, unlike the Vāsudeva-religion, the religious history of India knows hardly anything of the Arjuna-religion. It is suggested that the Ārjunāyanas mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudragupta were the followers of the Arjuna-cult<sup>35</sup>. This cannot be accepted. For one thing, if they were really the devotees of the divine Arjuna, according to P. IV.3.98, they should have been called Arjunakas and not Ārjunāyanas. Secondly, the context in the Allahabad Pillar inscription makes it quite clear that the Ārjunāyanas are represented there essentially as a socio-political entity rather than a religious one. It is more likely that the tribe of the Ārjunāyanas was so called because it claimed descent from the Pāṇḍava hero Arjuna<sup>36</sup>. The grammatical form of the word *ārjunāyana* would also confirm this<sup>37</sup>. Another suggestion is that P. IV.3.98 does not presuppose two independent religious sects — one of the Vāsudevakas and the other of the Arjunakas — but that the Sūtra refers to one single religious sect with Vāsudeva as the supreme god and Arjuna as the special devotee. Obviously, this suggestion runs counter to the essential trend of that Sūtra.

32. In the few passages where that word occurs, it invariably occurs in grammatical contexts.

33. Most of the pre-Pāṇinian Sanskrit literature, which has come down to us, is Vedic.

34. Much other evidence is available to support this assumption.

35. S. CHATTOPADHYAYA, *Evolution of Hindu Sects*, pp. 30 ff.

36. Cf. the Yaudheyas who must have claimed descent from Yudhiṣṭhira. The Yaudheyas and the Ārjunāyanas were closely related.

37. For details about the Ārjunāyanas mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar inscription, see: DANDEKAR, *A History of the Guptas*, p. 60.

We have to acquiesce in the fact that, in Pāṇini's time, there did prevail two independent religious cults, namely, the Vāsudeva-cult and the Arjuna-cult. Further, from the manner in which they have been referred to by Pāṇini, it may be assumed that these two cults were closely allied to each other — the Vāsudeva-cult having been regarded, even at that time, as being superior to the Arjuna-cult<sup>38</sup>. In the Ṛgvedic mythology, Viṣṇu is closely associated with Indra<sup>39</sup>. According to *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* II. 1.2.11 and V. 4.3.7, Arjuna is a secret or mystical (*guhya*) name of Indra, while, in later Vaiṣṇavism, the personality and character of Vedic Viṣṇu have been merged into those of Vāsudeva. Therefore, the alliance between the two independent religious sects, namely, the Vāsudeva-sect and the Arjuna-sect, with which Pāṇini seems to have been familiar, may be said to correspond, in a way, with the alliance between the two independent divinities of the Ṛgvedic mythology, namely, Viṣṇu and Indra. Another prototype of such an alliance between two independent religious cults is to be seen in the religious ideology pertaining to Nara and Nārāyaṇa<sup>40</sup>, wherein Nara may be regarded as the *alter ego* of Indra (of the *Ṛgveda*) and Arjuna (of P. IV.3.98) and Nārāyaṇa of Viṣṇu (of the *Ṛgveda*) and Vāsudeva (of P. IV.3.98). It would seem that, out of the two religious sects respectively centering round Vāsudeva and Arjuna, the Vāsudeva-sect, which was already regarded as the more dominant sect<sup>41</sup>, soon subdued and submerged within itself the Arjuna-sect. That is why we do not find any traces of this latter sect either in history or in literature.

The classical Vaiṣṇavism, with which one is generally familiar, is a kind of amalgam principally of four, originally independent, religious elements respectively embodied in the personalities of the four divinities, namely, Vāsudeva, Kṛṣṇa<sup>42</sup>, Viṣṇu, and Nārāyaṇa. The identification of Kṛṣṇa with Vāsudeva, which constituted perhaps the most vital stage in this process of amalgamation, seems to have already been an accomplished fact — indeed, of long standing — in Patañjali's time. The two names, Vāsudeva and Kṛṣṇa, occur in the *MB* almost as synonyms. For instance, while Vāsudeva is said to have killed Kāṁsa, *jaghāna kāṁsaṁ kila vāsudevah* (commentary on P. III.2.111), Kṛṣṇa is represented as having a grudge against his maternal uncle (Kāṁsa) — *asādhur mātule Kṛṣṇah* (commentary, some editions, on *Vārttika* 2 of P. II.3.36). More convincing still is Patañjali's commentary on *Vārttika* 15 of P. III.1.26, where the words *kṛṣṇa* and *vāsudeva* occur in the same context as the

38. The occurrence in P. IV.3.98 of the word *vāsudeva* before *arjuna* would suggest this.

39. See: DANDEKAR, *Viṣṇu in the Veda*, in *Kane Comm. Vol.*, pp. 95-111.

40. See the Nārāyaṇiya Section in the *Mahābhārata*. The concept of Nara-Nārāyaṇa, in its turn, is related to the concept of Puruṣa-Nārāyaṇa of *Śatapatha-Br. XII.3.4.*

41. See *supra*.

42. In a sense, Kṛṣṇa's personality was itself composite. See *infra*.

names of one and the same divine being: *citreṣu katham / citreṣv apy udgūrnā nipatitāś ca prahārā drṣyante kāṁsasya ca kṛṣṇasya ca / ... kecit kāṁsabhaktā bhavanti kecid vāsudevabhaktāḥ*<sup>43</sup>. Reference has already been made to the close association of Vāsudeva and Saṁkarṣaṇa as evidenced both by literature and inscriptions. While commenting on Vārttika 22 of P. II.2.24, Patañjali quotes, by way of illustration, a verse-half wherein Saṁkarṣaṇa is represented as being associated with Kṛṣṇa in exactly the same manner: *saṁkarsaṇadvitīyasya balaṁ kṛṣṇasya vārdhatām*.

As regards the relationship between Vāsudeva and Kṛṣṇa, the view is sometimes put forth that Kṛṣṇa was the original god, that Kṛṣṇa and Vāsudeva were not separate divine entities, and that Vāsudeva was just the patronym of Kṛṣṇa derived from his father's name Vasudeva. Several objections can be raised against this view. Firstly, the commentary on Vārttika 7 of P. IV.1.114 indicates that Vāsudeva, and not Vasudeva<sup>44</sup>, is the basic (underived) form of the name and that the termination *ān* affixed to this original name Vāsudeva also gives the form *vāsudeva*. Secondly, if Vāsudeva was really a patronym, Baladeva or Saṁkarṣaṇa, who is represented as the elder brother of Kṛṣṇa, should have been more aptly called Vāsudeva. But that is hardly ever the case. On the other hand we find Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva being specifically referred to by their matronyms, namely, Devakīputra and Rauhiṇeya respectively. The rivalry among some Kṣatriya princes for the real divine « Vāsudevahood », to which a reference has been made above, also clearly goes against Vāsudeva being regarded as a patronym. Jacobi has drawn attention<sup>45</sup> to the following etymology of the word *vāsudeva* given in the *Mahābhārata*: *vasanāt sarvabhūtānāṁ vasutvād devayonitah / vāsudevas tato vedyah*<sup>46</sup>. This would leave no doubt that *MBh* regarded Vāsudeva as the original name and not a patronym. More pertinent still is Ujjvaladatta's gloss on *Uṇādiśūtra* I.1 : *vāsuś ca devaś ce 'ti vāsudevah / tathā ca smṛtiḥ*<sup>47</sup>. Jacobi also mentions the fact<sup>48</sup>, which is particularly significant in the present context, namely, that the name Vāsubhadra sometimes occurs as an auxiliary of Vāsudeva<sup>49</sup>. Incidentally it may be added here that, just as Vāsudeva was not originally the patronym of Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa also was not originally an additional personal name of Vāsudeva, the god of Vāsudevism.

The main course of events, which eventually culminated in the identification of Vāsudeva and Kṛṣṇa seems to have been something like this: The religious ideology, with *bhakti* of Vāsudeva — the Vṛṣṇi prince

43. For a further discussion of this passage, see *infra*.

44. Indeed, Patañjali hardly ever speaks of Vasudeva.

45. H. JACOBI, *Über Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa-Vāsudeva*, in *Streitberg Festgabe*, p. 164.

46. *MBh*. V.68.3.

47. Quoted fully by JACOBI, *op. cit.*

48. *Op. cit.*, p. 163.

49. E.g. in Bhāsa's *Dūtavākyā* V.6.

who had come to be regarded as a god — as its central theme, must have arisen at a fairly early time so as to become thoroughly well established in the days of Pāṇini (5th century B.C.). Perhaps a little later than Vāsudevism, another religious sect grew round the figure of Kṛṣṇa, who had originally been the tribal hero and religious leader of the Yādavas. This Yādava Kṛṣṇa may as well have been the same as Devakīputra Kṛṣṇa who is represented, in the *Chāndogya-Upaniṣad* III.17.1, as a pupil of Ghora Āṅgirasa<sup>50</sup> and who is said to have learnt from his teacher the doctrine that man's life is a kind of sacrifice. The chronological evidence does not go against such assumption; if at all, it supports it. Be that as it may, Kṛṣṇa must be said to have developed his own special philosophy of life, the main tenets of which were *lokasamgraha* and renunciation *in* action rather than *of* action<sup>51</sup>. When, in course of time, the Vṛṣnis and the Yādavas, who were already related to each other, came closer together, presumably for political reasons, the personalities of Vṛṣṇi Vāsudeva and Yādava Kṛṣṇa were merged into each other so as to give rise to the new supreme god, Bhagavān Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa. This must have happened not long after Pāṇini's time. In the new legends, Vāsudeva came to be interpreted as the patronym of Kṛṣṇa. Some Vasudeva came to be regarded as Kṛṣṇa's father<sup>52</sup> and the Vṛṣṇi Saṅkarṣaṇa-Baladeva as his elder brother. In course of time, a third religious ideology, namely, the one which centered round Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa and which was presumably sponsored by the pastoral Ābhīras, came to be engrafted on the organically combined Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa religion. The teachings of Bhagavān Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa were soon consolidated and embodied in a popular religio-philosophical text. This text was later interpolated, obviously after suitable modifications, into the bardic-historical poem, *Jaya*, in the form of the *Bhagavadgītā*, whereby it served as the cornerstone of the superstructure which transformed the *Jaya* into the *Bhārata*<sup>53</sup>.

In Patañjali's time, Vāsudeva (or rather Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa) had already become a religio-legendary figure. He had come to be regarded

50. The name Ghora Āṅgirasa shows that he belonged to the popular — as against the hieratic — tradition of the *Atharvaveda*.

51. See: DANDEKAR, *Hinduism and the Bhagavadgītā: A fresh approach*, in JOIB 12, pp. 232-237.

52. Vasudeva is obviously an artificial back-formation from Vāsudeva. Though JACOBI does not subscribe to the view that Vāsudeva was the patronym of Kṛṣṇa he says that the etymologically correct name could be Vasudeva (*op. cit.*, p. 165). SUKUMAR SEN points out (SP, 14th AIOC, p. 103) that *vasu* and *vāsu* are respectively the normal and the lengthened grades of IE *wesu*. Therefore, according to him, Vasudeva = Vāsudeva. JACOBI mentions the case of Narasiṁha-Nārasiṁha (*op. cit.*, p. 164). Incidentally, JACOBI suggests (*op. cit.*, p. 163) that the name of Kṛṣṇa's father was Ānakadundubhi (*MBh.* II.30.12; III.21.7; XVI.7.1; *Harivaiśa* 24.15.16). Another hypothesis may be suggested in connection with this whole problem. If Vṛṣṇi Vāsudeva and Yādava Kṛṣṇa were two distinct personalities, Vasudeva could as well have been the name of Yādava Kṛṣṇa's father. Kṛṣṇa would then be Yādava (tribal name) as well as Vāsudeva (patronym). The merger of Vṛṣṇi Vāsudeva and Yādava Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa might have been facilitated by the common element Vāsudeva.

53. See: DANDEKAR, *The Mahābhārata: origin and growth*, in UCR 12, 65-85.

as having belonged to a remote past. P. III.2.111 — *anadyatane lan* — explains the use of the imperfect tense. The second Vārttika of that Sūtra — *parokṣe ca lokavijñāte prayoktur darśanavisaye* — prescribes that, with reference to a well-known event which has happened out of one's sight but which one could have seen, one should use the imperfect tense (*lan*) and not the perfect (*lit*). Here, Patañjali gives the example, *arunad yavanah sāketam*<sup>54</sup>. The historically well-known siege of Sāketa by the Yavana was a contemporaneous event in Patañjali's time. Though a person belonging to that period may not have actually seen it, in view of its contemporaneity, he could have witnessed it. Therefore he uses the imperfect tense form, *arunat*. As a counter-example, Patañjali mentions: *jaghāna kāṁsaṁ kila vāsudevah*. The killing of Karīsa by Vāsudeva was an event which was *parokṣa* (that is, which had happened out of one's sight) and *lokavijñāta* (traditionally well-known), but which was *prayoktuḥ adarśanavisaya* (that is, which was so ancient that it was not and could not have been seen by the speaker). Therefore, with reference to that event, the speaker had to use the perfect tense and not the imperfect tense. Thus, in Patañjali's time, the killing of Karīsa by Vāsudeva had already become a hoary or legendary event, an event of the remote past<sup>55</sup>.

Further evidence in this connection is provided by Patañjali's commentary on P. III.1.26 — *hetumati ca* — and its Vārttikas. The subject discussed therein is the use of the causal. Vārttika 6 of that Sūtra, namely, *ākhyānāt kṛtas tad ācaṣṭa iti kṛllukprakṛtipratyāpattih prakṛtivac ca kārakam*, tells us that *nic* (that is, the termination *aya*) should be appended to a verbal noun expressive of an event in the sense of narrating that event. « The derivative suffix is to be dropped, the noun reduced to the form of the original root from which it is derived, and it is to this root that the termination *aya* is to be appended ». By way of illustration, Patañjali says that, according to this Vārttika, the statement *kāṁsaṁ ghātayati* would mean that one narrates the event of the killing of Karīsa and the statement *balīṁ bandhayati* would mean that one narrates the event of the confinement of Bali. Then, in his commentary on Vārttika 7 — *ākhyānāc ca prativedhah* — Patañjali poses the question: Is this rule applicable only in respect of the traditionally well-known legends like the Karīsa-vadha or is it applicable also in respect of any normal everyday happening whereby *rājānam āgamayati* may be used

54. This is one of the passages which have been pressed into service for determining the date of Patañjali.

55. It is suggested that the story of the enmity between Karīsa and Kṛṣṇa may be understood as symbolising « a struggle between the mother-right represented by the maternal uncle Karīsa and the father-right by the sister's son Kṛṣṇa, in which the latter, a representative of the younger generation, emerges victorious » (S. JAISWAL, *The Origin and Development of Vaiṣṇavism*, p. 66).

in the sense of *rājāgamanam ācaste*<sup>56</sup>. We may not go into the details of this whole discussion. For our present purpose it is enough to note that Patañjali regards the killing of Kainsa and the confinement of Bali as traditionally well-established legendary events.

In his commentary on Vārttika 15 — *kurvataḥ prayojaka iti cet tulyam* — Patañjali raises another question which is of great interest from various points of view. The causal forms *ghātayati* and *bandhayati* in the foregoing illustrations are of the present tense, while the events of Kainsa-vadha and Bali-bandha belong to a remote past. How can these two things be reconciled? Patañjali explains the propriety of the present tense in this context in the following manner: the statement *karīsaṁ ghātayati* means (according to Vārttika 6) that one conveys to others the information regarding the event of the killing of Kainsa. This, one can do in three ways — (a) through the presentation of that event on the stage or (b) by depicting the event pictorially or (c) by means of a direct narration. So far as the stage-presentation is concerned, the producers of the play create the illusion, before our very eyes, of the actor playing the role of Kṛṣṇa actually killing the actor playing the role of Kainsa<sup>57</sup>. Thus the present tense *ghātayati* is quite appropriate in that context<sup>58</sup>. Even in a picture, the artist depicts the scene of the killing of Kainsa, with all the hits and blows of Kainsa and Kṛṣṇa, in such a way that one feels as if the whole event is taking place in one's very presence<sup>59</sup>. Then there are the Paurāṇikas — Patañjali uses the word *granthika* which Kaiyatā explains as *kathaka* (narrator). Through their remarkable narrative skill they make the episode of Kainsa-vadha live before their large audiences. By means of suitable modulation of voice, often accompanied by corresponding gesticulation, they succeed in rousing the dormant emotions of their hearers, some of whom subconsciously sympathise with Kainsa and some with Vāsudeva. And these their emotions then become manifest on their faces<sup>60</sup>. So, here too, the present tense is legitimate. Patañjali further adds that, in connection with this last, one actually finds all the three tenses being used. One may say: « Go to the Purāṇa-session; Kainsa is being killed (that is, the Paurāṇika is just at the point of narrating the killing of Kainsa) ». Or « Go to the Purāṇa-session; Kainsa will soon be killed (that is, the Paurāṇika will soon

56. *kim punar yāny etāni saṁjñābhūtāny ākhyānāni tata utpattyā bhavitavyam āhosvit kriyānvākhyānamātrāt.*

57. Cf. *avasthānukṛtī nātyam*.

58. *citreṣu katham | citreṣv apy udgurṇā nipatitāś ca prahārā dṛṣyante karīsasya ksāni ca balīn bandhayanti.*

59. *citreṣu katham | citreṣu apy udgurṇā nipatitāś ca prahārā dṛṣyante karīsasya ca kṛṣṇasya ca (v.l. dṛṣyante karīsakarṣaṇyāś ca).*

60. *granthikeṣu kathām yatra śabdagadumātraṁ lakṣyate | te 'pi hi teṣām utpattiprabhṛty ā vināśād rddhīr vyācakṣānāḥ sato buddhivīṣayān prakāṣayanti | ātaś ca sato vyāmīśrā hi dṛṣyante | kecīt karīsabhaktā bhavanti kecīd vāsudevabhktāḥ | varṇānyatvām khalv api puṣyanti | kecīd raktamukhā bhavanti kecīt kālamukhāḥ.*

commence the narration of the killing of Karṇsa) ». Or « What is the use of attending the Purāṇa-session now; Karṇsa is already killed (that is, the Paurāṇika has already finished the narration of the killing of Karṇsa) »<sup>61</sup>.

A reference may be made here to certain incidental points which have emerged from this portion in Patañjali's commentary on Vārttika 15 of P. III.1.26. Keith thinks<sup>62</sup> that the passage, *ye tāvad ete śobhanikā nāma...*<sup>63</sup>, contains 'the first mention of drama in Indian literature'. The word *śobhanika* does not occur any where else in Sanskrit literature. Its meaning, namely, 'producer of a drama' (see above), is, therefore, more or less conjectural. It is suggested that *śobhanika* may be a misreading for *śaubhika* or *saubhika*<sup>64</sup>. But lexicons explain *śaubhika* or *saubhika* as 'juggler' or 'conjuror'<sup>65</sup>. In that case, the present passage may be understood as alluding to a puppet-show, where the artist has to manipulate or juggle with the puppets, rather than to a dramatic performance. Or does it imply the drama-producer's conjuring up an illusion of reality<sup>66</sup>?

Keith also seems to have misunderstood the passage regarding the *granthikas*<sup>67</sup>. He speaks of them as if they were performers of drama. According to him, 'the *granthikas* divided themselves into two parts, one representing the followers of Karṇsa with blackened faces, the other those of Kṛṣṇa with red faces, and they expressed the feeling of both parties throughout the struggle from Kṛṣṇa's birth to the death of Karṇsa'<sup>68</sup>. He further adds: « The mention of the colour of the two parties is most significant: red man slays black man: the spirit of spring and summer prevails over the spirit of the dark winter »<sup>69</sup>. All this is patently farfetched. The word *granthika* clearly denotes a narrator or a Paurāṇika<sup>70</sup>. The words, *śabdagadumātram* and *vyācaksāñāḥ*, occurring in this context render this quite certain. Again, the passage, *kecit karṇsabhaktā bhavanti...*, does not refer to the *granthikas* dividing themselves into two parties. It rather hints at the differing subconscious sympathies (*bhakti*) of the hearers, on account of which they are described as being *vyāmiśra*. The Paurāṇikas, as true artists, rouse the emotions born out of these innate sympathies (*buddhiviṣayān prakāśayanti*)<sup>71</sup>. These emotions then

61. *traikālyāṁ khalv api loke lakṣyate | gaccha hanyate karṇsaḥ | gaccha ghāniṣyate karṇsaḥ | kīṁ gatena hataḥ karṇsa iti.*

62. JRAS 1911, p. 1008.

63. See foot-note 58.

64. V. P. LIMAYE, *Critical Studies on the Mahābhāṣya*, p. 168.

65. The other meaning of *śaubhika* is given as 'hunter' or 'fowler'.

66. That is what a drama usually is.

67. See foot-note 60.

68. *Op. cit.*

69. It has been pointed out, in this connection, that Viṣṇu, with whom Kṛṣṇa is identified, is a solar divinity in the *Rgveda*.

70. As pointed out above, Kaiyatā explains it as *kathaka*.

71. Cf. *Vākyapadiya* III.7.5. It is significant that the *Abhinavabhāratī* (on *NS* 37.25) quotes the passage *sato buddhiviṣayān prakāśayanti*.

become manifest through the colours of the faces of the hearers (cf. *varṇānyatvam khalv api puṣyanti*). It also needs to be emphasised that the words *karīsabhabitāḥ* and *vāsudevabitktāḥ* do not denote two different religious cults<sup>72</sup> — *bhakta* here simply means 'having sympathy for'<sup>73</sup>.

One more point. According to Weber (IS 13, p. 491), the fact that, in Patañjali's commentary on *Vārttika* 6 of P. III.1.26, the episodes of *Karīsa-vadha* (of which Kṛṣṇa is the hero) and the *Bali-bandha* (of which Viṣṇu is the hero) have been mentioned together is significant. Though it may not prove that Kṛṣṇa was identical with Viṣṇu, it does show that Kṛṣṇa and Viṣṇu stood in close relationship with each other<sup>74</sup>. It would, however, seem that, though there is no clear indication in the *MB* that Kṛṣṇa was identified with Viṣṇu, the identification must have occurred much before Patañjali's time. Apart from the facts that Kṛṣṇa is called *Keśava* in Patañjali's commentary on P. II.2.34 and that *Vāsudeva* is referred to as *Janārdana* in his commentary on P. VI.3.6, in the *Bhagavadgītā*, Kṛṣṇa is directly addressed as *Viṣṇu*<sup>75</sup>. Incidentally, attention may be drawn to Patañjali's reference to *Govinda* in his commentary on *Vārttika* 2 of P. III.1.138: *gavi ca vindeh samjnāyam*<sup>76</sup>. As has been pointed out above, the religion of the Ābhīra *Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa* had been grafted on that of the *Vṛṣṇi-Yādava* *Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa* at quite an early date<sup>77</sup>.

The legends relating to *Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa* occur in the Buddhist<sup>78</sup>, the Jaina<sup>79</sup>, and the Hindu literary texts. There is every reason to presume that, apart from the *Mahābhārata*, there existed in Patañjali's time some

72. It is pointed out that even in the 4th century B.C. both *Karīsa* and *Kṛṣṇa* were regarded as pastoral deities, as the *Kauṭilya-Arthaśāstra* (XIV.3) prescribes their invocation for those engaged in collecting medicinal herbs (S. JAISWAL, *op. cit.*, p. 65).

73. See above the discussion of P. IV.3.95. It may be added that the comments of the *Kāśikāpadamāñjari* on this whole passage confirm what has been said above.

74. KEITH (JRAS 1908, 169-175) derives from this fact the solar character of Kṛṣṇa.

75. BG XI.24, 30.

76. The word *govinda* has also been derived from *gopendra*. Recently, S. K. CHATTERJI (*Ruben Fel.* Vol. 1970, pp. 347-52) has connected the word *govinda* with the Old Irish *boand*, so that *govinda* would mean 'fair or beautiful on account of cows'. R. G. BHANDARKAR (*Vaiṣṇavism, Saivism, and Minor Religious Systems*, p. 51) rejects the idea that the name *Govinda* has something to do with cows. At the same time he connects it with Indra's epithet *govid* (=finder of cows) in the *RV*. In *Baudhāyana-Dharmasūtra* II.5.24, Viṣṇu is called *Govinda*.

77. The *Bhagavadgītā* uses the word *govinda* with reference to Kṛṣṇa two times (I.32, II.9). Curiously enough, neither the *Bhagavadgītā* nor the *MB* mentions *Nārāyaṇa*. It is, however, suggested (S. JAISWAL, *op. cit.*, p. 37) that *Bhagavat* of the *BG* is no other than *Nārāyaṇa*. This is quite unconvincing. P. IV.1.99 refers to the termination *phak* (in the sense of *gotrāpatya*; e.g. *naḍasya gotrāpatyāṇi nāḍāyanāḥ*). However, it is suggested that *phak* also signifies 'resting place'. *Nāra* means a collection of men; *nārāyaṇa* would then mean « the supreme god who is the resting place of *nāra* ».

78. Cf. the *Ghaṭājātaka*.

79. Cf. the *Āñtagaḍadasāo*; also see *supra*.

Kāvyas of the classical type glorifying Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa and his exploits. Indeed, Patañjali has derived many of his illustrations from such Kāvyas<sup>80</sup>. In the context of the discussion regarding the Bahuvrīhi compound, Patañjali, in his commentary on Vārttika 22 of P. II.2.24, poses the question as to why, in the verse-half *saṁkarṣaṇadvitīya* *ya* *ba* *la* *m kṛṣṇasya* *vardhatām*, the compound *saṁkarṣaṇadvitīya*, and, in the verse-quarter *asidvitīyo* 'nusasāra pāṇḍavam', the compound *asidvitīya* should not take the dual number in accordance with the rule *dvayor dvivacanam*, and answers it by pointing out that the second member of those Bahuvrīhi compounds, namely, *dvitīya*, is to be understood in the sense of *sahāya* (companion or helper) so that the question of 'twoness' would not arise at all. Leaving aside the grammatical point which Patañjali has made here, we may only note what is relevant to our present purpose, namely, that Patañjali must have been familiar with a Kāvya (or Kāvyas) — now, unfortunately, not available to us — dealing with Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa and the Pāṇḍavas<sup>81</sup> from which he has quoted, by way of illustration, the verse-half (in the *śloka* metre), *saṁkarṣaṇadvitīya* *ya* *ba* *la* *m kṛṣṇasya* *vardhatām*, and the verse-quarter (in the *upajāti* metre), *asidvitīyo* 'nusasāra pāṇḍavam<sup>82</sup>'.

P. II.2.34 — *alpāctaram* — lays down the rule that the word which has a smaller number of syllables should be made the first member of a Dvandva compound. In connection with the discussion as to whether this rule is to be made applicable specifically to a Dvandva compound consisting of two members only (as is indicated by *tara*), Patañjali quotes the two verse-quarters in the *pramāṇikā* metre, *mṛdaṅgaśāṅkhātūṇavāḥ* *prthāṇ nadanti* *saṁsadi*, and one verse-quarter in the *praharṣīṇī* metre, *prāsāde dhanapatiṛāmakeśavānām* (where the words *rāma* and *keśava* respectively denote Saṁkarṣaṇa-Balarāma and Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa), the Dvandva compounds in which, namely, *mṛdaṅgaśāṅkhātūṇavāḥ* and *dhanapatiṛāmakeśavānām*, apparently show that the rule *alpāctaram* is not applicable to Dvandva compounds having more than two members. Of course, Patañjali has his own explanation of this. Incidentally, it may be pointed out that these verse-quarters are understood by some scholars as belonging to one and the same context, namely, the playing of musical instruments in festivals celebrated in the temple of Dhana-pati-Rāma-Keśava<sup>83</sup>. This does not, however, seem to be correct. The words *saṁsadi* and *prāsāde* clearly indicate two different contexts; so

80. Whether it was one Kāvya or several Kāvyas, it is difficult to determine. The *Kaṁsavadha* was probably a drama known to Patañjali. See *supra*.

81. Even Pāṇini seems to have been familiar with some *Mahābhārata* (cf. P. VI.2.38) characters: Kuntī (P. IV.1.176), Yudhiṣṭhīra (P. VIII.3.95), Drauṇī (P. IV.1.103).

82. They do not look as if they have been specially composed by Patañjali to serve as illustrations. Incidentally, it is not clear as to which situation *asidvitīyo* ... refers.

83. Cf. R. G. BHANDARKAR, *op. cit.*, p. 17; S. JAISWAL, *op. cit.*, p. 145; B. N. PURI, *India in the time of Patañjali*, pp. 81, 250; S. CHATTOPADHYAYA, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-42.

too perhaps do the two different metres. It may be further added that archaeologists have so far not come across any temple dedicated jointly to Kubera, Balarāma, and Kṛṣṇa. In some editions of the *MB*, *asādhur mātule kṛṣṇah* — a verse-quarter in the *śloka* metre from some Kāvya — is quoted to illustrate Vārttika 2 (*sādhwasādhuprayoge ca*) of P. II.3.36 (*saptamy adhikarane ca*). A reference has already been made to the verse-quarter in the *upendravajrā* metre, *jaghāna kāṁsaṁ kila vāsudevah*, which is quoted by Patañjali as a counter-illustration in his commentary on Vārttika 2 of P. III.2.111<sup>84</sup>.

According to P. VI.3.4 (*manasah saṁjñāyām*), the instrumental form *manasā* remains unchanged if it is the first member of a compound denoting a name: e.g. *manasādattā*. It remains unchanged also if the second member of the compound is *ājñāyin*: *manasājñāyī* (P. VI.3.5: *ājñāyini ca*). Vārttikas 1 (*ātmanaś ca pūrṇe*)<sup>85</sup> and 2 (*anyārthe ca*) of P. VI.3.5 lay down that the same thing happens in respect of the instrumental form *ātmanā* in such compounds as *ātmanāpañcamāḥ*. However, this rule of *aluk* or the non-dropping of the case-termination is applicable only to Tatpuruṣa compounds. As a counter-illustration, Patañjali quotes in his commentary on Vārttika 2 the verse-half in the *upendravajrā* metre, *janārdanas tv ātmacaturtha eva*. The compound *ātmacaturtha* is a Bahuvrīhi compound, and so there is no *aluk*. Apart from the fact that this verse-quarter indicates Patañjali's familiarity with a Kāvya dealing with Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, it is significant from another point of view also. Janārdana or Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa here seems to be represented as being identical with a whole of which he himself is a fourth. This is evidently a reference to the doctrine of Vyūhas. It is suggested that Janārdana or Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, while being, in a sense, identical with the totality of the four Vyūhas, is also one of those four Vyūhas<sup>86</sup>.

Doubts have been expressed about the genuineness of this verse-quarter quoted by Patañjali on the ground that the doctrine of Vyūhas had not developed in his time. It is pointed out that in the inscriptions of about that period, such as those of Ghosundi and Nanaghat<sup>87</sup>, Saṅkarṣaṇa is given precedence over Vāsudeva, while in the Vyūha-doctrine he is represented as being subordinate to Vāsudeva. It is, therefore, presumed that the Vyūha-doctrine must not have been consolidated at the time of those inscriptions as also of Patañjali. It is, however, not improbable

84. See *supra*.

85. Vārttika 1 of P. VI.3.5 also occurs as P. VI.3.6.

86. The *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa* (IV.36 ff.) describes the supreme god as *caturvyūhātman*. The word *ātmacaturtha* may also refer to Nārāyaṇa who manifested himself in the four forms, Nara, Nārāyaṇa, Hari, and Kṛṣṇa (*MBh.* XII.321.16). It may be noted that the *Bhagavadgītā* does not refer to the doctrine of Vyūhas, but that Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa is called Janārdana in six passages (I.36; I.39; I.44; III.1; X.18; XI.51). Incidentally, Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa, Bharata, and Sastrughna are regarded as the four forms of the supreme god Rāma.

87. See *supra*.

that the religious ideology in which Saṅkarṣaṇa was superior to Vāsudeva was quite independent of the Vyūha-doctrine, and that the two ideologies prevailed contemporaneously. The worship of Saṅkarṣaṇa representing an independent religious sect must have been quite popular in early times<sup>88</sup>. Presumably it arose more or less contemporaneously with Vāsudevism, but it seems to have had a restricted sphere of influence. One development in the religious history of that period was that the two independent religions, namely, the Saṅkarṣaṇa-religion and the Vāsudeva-religion, came to be closely allied with each other, the precedence in that alliance having been apparently given to Saṅkarṣaṇa<sup>89</sup>. Actually the two religious sects must have merged together on terms of equality. Saṅkarṣaṇa was mentioned first only formally, and that because he happened to be the elder one of the two Vṛṣṇi princes who had been deified. However, it was the Vāsudeva-religion which became more dominant in course of time<sup>90</sup>. The other development, perhaps independent of the first, was in the direction of the evolution of the doctrine of Vyūhas according to which the four deified Vṛṣṇi heroes stood for the four religio-philosophical concepts — Vāsudeva for the Highest Self, Saṅkarṣaṇa for the individual self, Pradyumna for Manas (mind), and Aniruddha for Ahaṁkāra (egoism). It has also to be emphasised that the quotation, *janārdanas tv ātmacaturtha eva*, occurs in a very natural way and fits in very well in that particular context in Patañjali's commentary on Vārttika 2 of P. VI.3.5. It does not give any occasion whatsoever for the suspicion that it is an interpolation.

88. The Saṅkarṣaṇa-cult is mentioned for the first time in *Kauṭilya-Arthashastra* XIII.3.67. Dionysos referred to by Megasthenes may be identified with Saṅkarṣaṇa. See also S. JAISWAL, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-59.

89. R. P. CHANDA has suggested (*Archaeology and Vaiṣṇava Tradition*, p. 403) that, in the 2nd century B.C., there were two forms of Vāsudeva-worship — one in which Vāsudeva was worshipped as the supreme god and the other in which he was worshipped as a god second to Saṅkarṣaṇa.

90. One is here reminded of a similar situation in the history of Maratha saints. Though Nivṛttinātha, as the elder brother, was given precedence, it was the younger brother, Jñānadeva, who became more prominent in course of time.